

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION FOUR

In re H.M., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

H.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A144605

(San Mateo County
Super. Ct. No. 83266)

I.

INTRODUCTION

Appellant H.M. appeals from the juvenile court's jurisdictional findings following a hearing held on February 26, 2015, at which she admitted a misdemeanor shoplifting offense, and the juvenile court continued her wardship and place her on probation. Appellant's counsel has filed an opening brief in which no issues are raised and asks this court for an independent review of the record as required by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). Counsel has declared that appellant has been notified that no issues were being raised by counsel on appeal and that an independent review under *Wende* instead was being requested. Appellant was also advised of his right personally to file a supplemental brief raising any issues he chooses to bring to this court's attention. No supplemental brief has been filed by appellant personally.

II.

BACKGROUND

On December 26, 2014, the San Mateo County District Attorney filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, subdivision (a) petition alleging that appellant violated Penal Code section 459.5 (misdemeanor shoplifting). A detention hearing was held on February 18, 2015, at which appellant made her first appearance in response to the petition, and the matter was continued to February 26.

At the jurisdiction hearing on February 26, 2015, after being admonished as to her constitutional rights, appellant waived her rights and admitted the shoplifting violation. As a result, the juvenile court continued appellant as a ward of the court, reinstated probation and released her home to attend a regular high school and not the continuation school she had been attending. The court determined the maximum period of confinement was eight months. New terms of probation were ordered consistent with the offense and appellant's juvenile justice history.

A notice of appeal was timely filed on March 19, 2015.

III.

CONCLUSIONS BASED UPON INDEPENDENT RECORD REVIEW

Upon our independent review of the record we conclude there are no meritorious issues to be argued, or that require further briefing on appeal. The true finding made at the February 26, 2015 hearing was admitted by appellant, supported by the evidence presented, and we discern no error in the disposition. The disposition appellant received, including the calculation of the maximum period of confinement, and conditions of probation imposed were chosen by the juvenile court in accordance with applicable juvenile law principles, and were supported by the law and facts. At all times appellant was represented by counsel.

IV.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

RUVOLO, P. J.

We concur:

REARDON, J.

RIVERA, J.